

**REMARKS**

Reconsideration of the above identified application in view of the preceding amendments and following remarks is respectfully requested. Claims 5-8, 11, 12, 14 and 16-21 are pending in this application. By this Amendment, Applicants have amended Claims 5-8, 11, 12 and 14 and cancelled Claims 1-4, 9, 10, 13 and 15. The claim amendments were made to more precisely define the invention in accordance with 35 U.S.C. 112, paragraph 2. These amendments have not been necessitated by the need to distinguish the present invention from any prior art. It is respectfully submitted that no new matter has been introduced by these amendments, as support therefore is found throughout the specification and drawings.

Applicant notes with appreciation that the Office Action acknowledges the being responsive to the Amendment filed on July 17, 2006. Applicant notes with appreciation that the Office Action includes a copy of the PTO Form SB/08 that was submitted in the IDS filed on August 21, 2006. Each reference listed therein is initialed by the Examiner, thereby indicating that each reference will be listed on the face of any patent that issues from the present invention.

In the Office Action, Claims 1-15 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103 (a) over U.S. Published Patent Application No. 2002/0151161 to Furusawa in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,766,734 to Geddes. This rejection is traversed.

Furusawa relates to the field of integrated circuits also known as microelectronics and nanostructures.

Geddes relates to the field of transferring images to ceramic items such as dinner plates. The object of Geddes is to transfer a relatively large image without distorting the

image. Referring to Figures 24-31, Geddes discloses forming a decal 410 (see Figure 26) to be pressure laminated onto a ceramic item 12. The decal 410 includes a paper substrate 226 with a wax release layer thereon 36. A transferable covercoat 242 is on the wax layer 36. The covercoat 242 ultimately becomes the top coat of the dinner plate. An ink image 222 sits on the covercoat 242 and a pressure sensitive transfer adhesive 412 is put over the ink image 22. This decal 410 is pressure laminated onto the dinner plate 12 by rollers 425 (see Figure 27).

It is respectfully submitted that one skilled in the art to which the subject invention appertains would not have been motivated to combine Furusawa with Geddes as suggested by the Examiner. The dinner plate teachings of Geddes are clearly far a field from the high technology semiconductor manufacturing art of the subject application. Thus, one must consider if Geddes is analogous art pursuant to M.P.E.P. Section 2141(a), which states that “[a] reference is reasonably pertinent if, even though it may be in a different field from that of the inventor’s endeavor, it is one which, logically would have commended itself to an inventor’s attention in considering his problem.” Further, the M.P.E.P. notes at section 2145 IX that the prior art reference is analogous if the reference is not in the relevant field but “the reference is reasonably pertinent to the particular problem with which the inventor was concerned.” Again, the teachings of Geddes are directed to transferring a dinner plate image 222 and that is what the decal 410 does. The ultimate adhesion occurs when the covercoat 242 is baked on to a dinner plate. It is unclear how this is applicable to the concerns of the subject application. Thus, for these reasons, Geddes cannot be considered an obvious place in which to look for guidance and, therefore, Geddes is non-analogous art. Consequently, the rejection of pending

claims under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) is improper and should be withdrawn.

Further, one would not logically look to the art of making dinner plates to solve a problem related to forming nanostructure wires for electrical circuits. The M.P.E.P. elaborates on this concept in section 2145 III by noting that the “claimed combination cannot change the principle of operation of the primary reference.” The principle of operation in Furusawa is to selectively apply a fine particle dispersion only to specifically patterned lyophilic regions to achieve the desired performance. Despite noting avoidance of photolithography as the primary advantage of Furusawa’s method, it still teaches using photolithography to create the patterned lyophilic regions. This key principle of operation, namely using photolithography to create a pattern, would be obliterated by applying the pressure sensitive adhesive of Geddes and laminating the structure of Furusawa. In view of this additional reason, application of the method of Geddes to the teachings of Furusawa is not a proper combination. Without a motivation, teaching, suggestion or rationale to combine these references in the manner suggested by the Examiner, the combination must be withdrawn and an action acknowledging the same is respectfully requested. Accordingly, the pending claims are patentable over the combination of Furusawa and Geddes.

Furthermore for the sake of argument, even if the references of Furusawa and Geddes were combined as suggested by the Examiner, the claimed invention would not be obtained. There is nothing in either of these references that discloses or suggests, either alone or in combination, in whole or in part, the device defined by amended Claim 5 of the subject application. In particular, there is nothing in either Furusawa or Geddes which discloses or suggests, a method for forming a multilayer wiring structure, including

preparing a first substrate at least one surface of which is a first adhesive face having specified adhesion that is decreased by application of ultraviolet rays or heat treatment, disposing droplets of a first liquid containing electrically conductive particles dispersed in a solvent on the first adhesive face, vaporizing the solvent from the droplets to form a first wiring pattern on the first adhesive face, preparing a second substrate at least one surface of which is a second adhesive face having specified adhesion, disposing droplets of a second liquid containing electrically conductive particles dispersed in a solvent on the second adhesive face, vaporizing the solvent from the droplets to form a second wiring pattern on the second adhesive face, stacking the first substrate and the second substrate such that the first adhesive face faces a first face of the second substrate opposite the second adhesive face and a through hole overlaps the first wiring pattern, and removing the first wiring pattern from the first substrate such that the first wiring pattern is transferred to the first face of the second substrate. Neither Furusawa nor Geddes, alone or in combination, in whole or part, teach, disclose or suggest such steps. The other independent claim, namely Claim 14, has similar limitations. Thus, Claims 5, 14 and each of the claims depending therefrom are not rendered obvious by the combination of references cited by the Examiner, and withdrawal of the rejection under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) is respectfully requested.

Still further, the Examiner took Official Notice that specific materials employed as well as the concept of stacking the substrates are well-known and conventional in the art. The Applicant's representative hereby seasonably traverses such Official Notice and requests evidence in support of same in the event that the rejections are maintained. As stated in the M.P.E.P., section 2144.03, Official Notice unsupported by documentary

evidence should only be taken by the Examiner where the facts asserted to be well-known, or to be common knowledge in the art are capable of instant and unquestionable demonstration as being well-known. The M.P.E.P. further states that it is never appropriate to rely solely on "common knowledge" in the art without evidentiary support in the record, as the principal evidence upon which a rejection was based. *Zurko*, 258 F.3d at 1385, 59 USPQ2d at 1697. One must point to some concrete evidence in the record in support of these findings. If such evidence is not supplied, Applicant respectfully requests the Examiner to withdraw the rejection.

Any additional fees or overpayments due as a result of filing the present paper may be applied to Deposit Account No. 04-1105. It is respectfully submitted that all of the claims now remaining in this application are in condition for allowance, and such action is earnestly solicited.

If after reviewing this amendment, the Examiner believes that a telephone interview would facilitate the resolution of any remaining matters the undersigned attorney may be contacted at the number set forth herein below.

Respectfully submitted,

Date: December 5, 2006

  
John J. Penny, Jr. Reg. No. 36,984  
George N. Chaclas, Reg. No. 46,608  
Edwards Angell Palmer & Dodge LLP  
Attorney for Applicants  
P.O. Box 55874  
Boston, MA 02205  
Tel: (401) 276-6653  
Fax: (888) 325-1684  
Email: gchaclas@eapdlaw.com